SR161 Route Development Plan - Study Criteria

Objective measurements used for selecting route improvement strategies

Goal A: Improve safety on the route

- *Provide long sight lines, turn lanes and wide shoulders whenever possible*
- *Maximize distance between public access points along the route*
- *Promote pedestrian safety*
- *Provide adequate hazard signing*
- *Provide guard rail in critical locations*
- *Improve fog-line striping*

Design standards incorporate engineering knowledge about safety/benefits/costs

Does the alternative meet design standards?

Design Standards Rating	Score
The alternative meets WSDOT standards	5
There are minor discrepancies between the alternative and WSDOT standards	3
The alternative is unrelated to WSDOT design standards	0
The alternative clearly doesn't meet WSDOT standards, but precedents exist	-3
There is no precedent for this non-standard alternative	-5

Deficiencies about the route have been considered and identified by WSDOT and the public

Does the alternative address specific concerns raised by WSDOT or the public?

Specific Concerns Rating	Score
The alternative directly addresses an established or stated safety concern	5
The alternative indirectly addresses an established or stated safety concern	3
The alternative is unrelated to any identified safety concerns	0

Access management is the system for controlling how private accesses are developed

Does the alternative promote access management?

Access Management Rating	Score
The alternative will result in fewer accesses on the route	5
The alternative has no impact on the number of accesses on the route	0
The alternative will result in a greater number of accesses on the route	-5

SR161 Route Development Plan - Study Criteria

Objective measurements used for selecting route improvement strategies

Goal B: Promote efficient travel time

- *Promote through traffic movement by providing turn lanes and passing lanes in critical locations*
- *Control the number and frequency of access points to the highway*
- *Explore opportunities to use Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology on the route*
- *Promote the development of alternate modes of transportation through cooperation with other agencies*
- *Limit the use of traffic signals*

A traffic model can be used to find the roadway's traffic characteristics or LOS

WSDOT has standards for highway level of service (LOS) based on route classification

Proposals unrelated to highway maintenance or construction can contribute to travel time reduction for different kinds of travelers

Does the traffic model show that the alternative meets LOS standards in 2022?

Will travel time be reduced for non-automotive travelers?

Level of Service Rating	Score
The alternative will reduce travel time in 2022	5
The alternative will reduce travel time for non-automotive travelers in 2022	3
The alternative will not affect travel time in 2022	0
The alternative will increase travel time in 2022	-5

SR161 Route Development Plan - Study Criteria

Objective measurements used for selecting route improvement strategies

Goal C: Preserve the integrity of the rural landscape

- *Identify areas or locations of scenic interest and provide scenic pullouts*
- *Preserve and plant native plants in the right of way*
- *Promote and encourage cooperation between agencies to develop land use and transportation policies that preserve and enhance the rural landscape*

Maps depicting environmental issues in the surrounding landscape can be compiled

These maps can be used to analyze alternatives and their relationship to the environment

Will adverse environmental impacts be an important issue for the proposed alternative?

Environmental Rating	Score
The alternative is among those with the least impact on the environment	5
The alternative has an average impact on the environment	0
The alternative is among those with the most impact on the environment	-5

WSDOT cooperates with other agencies to promote efficient transportation solutions

Does the alternative promote interagency cooperation?

Cooperative Rating	Score
The alternative is consistent with other transportation plans for the area	5
The alternative partly addresses solutions found in other transportation plans	3
The alternative is inconsistent with or related to with other transportation plans	0

SR161 Route Development Plan - Study Criteria

Objective measurements used for selecting route improvement strategies

Goal D: Serve the needs of our communities and visitors

- *Provide informational signing for attractions on the route, "scenic" locations, and historic/interpretive markers*
- *Provide a rest area on the route*
- *Consider pursuit of designation as a State Scenic & Recreational Highway*
- *Find projects that maximize benefits and minimize costs (staff added)*

Community economic interests can be served by various state and federal grant programs

Grant applications and qualifications are well-defined

Will the alternative qualify for an economic or scenic highways grant?

Grant Rating	Score
The alternative is likely to qualify, and a local sponsor is identified	5
The alternative is likely to qualify, but a local sponsor is not identified	4
Its uncertain whether the alternative would qualify	3
The alternative is unlikely to qualify, but a local sponsor is motivated	2
The alterative is unlikely to qualify for an economic or scenic grant	1
The alternative is unrelated to economic or scenic grants	0

The likelihood of project funding is fundamental to alternative selection

FHWA HERS software can compare similar state routes and project benefit/cost

How does the alternative compare to likely improvements on similar routes statewide?

B/C Rating	Score
The alternative is likely to be funded (top 20%)	5
The alternative is less likely to be funded (next 20%)	3
The alternative is unrelated to the B/C comparison process	0
The alternative is not likely to be funded (next 40%)	-3
The alternative is very unlikely to be funded (bottom 20%)	-5

SR161 Route Development Plan - Study Criteria

Objective measurements used for selecting route improvement strategies

Goal D: Serve the needs of our communities and visitors

continued . . .

Non-motorized users are among the community members and visitors served by SR 161

Proposed improvements can improve travel characteristics for these users

Improvements that improve travel for both types of users are beneficial

Does the alternative accommodate motorized and non-motorized travelers?

Non-motorized user rating	Score
The alternative does not accommodate both uses	-5
The alternative only accommodates one use	0
The alternative accommodates both uses	5